UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/773,685	01/31/2001	Aditya Srivastava	020431.0715	7923

7590 03/04/2004	**EXAMINER**
Christopher W. Kennerly	ZHEN, WEI Y
Baker Botts L.L.P.	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2122	

Christopher W. Kennerly
Baker Botts L.L.P.
6th Floor
2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/773,685		SRIVASTAVA ET AL.	
	Examiner		**Art Unit**	
	Wei Y Zhen		2122	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _31 January 2001_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-57_ is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-57_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-57 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lau, U.S.

Patent No. 6,598,219 in view of Tilden et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US

2002/0129345.

        As per claim 1, Lau discloses

        A document manager operable to manage activities relating to one or more XML based

data documents associated with an application, each data document modeling data associated

with the application and representing relationships that may exist between the data documents

and one or more data documents (col. 2 lines 35-56); the framework providing a generic XML

based transaction engine, the application being one of a plurality of distributed applications each

being an instance of the generic transaction engine (col. 6 lines 25-34).

        Lau does not explicitly disclose

A rule manager operable to manager rules that specify logic for the handling of notifications associated with XML based action documents received at the application, the notifications requesting actions involving data documents; an operations manager operable to manage execution of transactions involving data documents based on one or more operations defined for the applications during its developments.

However, Tilden et al disclose a rule manager operable to manager rules that specify logic for the handling of notifications associated with XML based action documents received at the application, the notifications requesting actions involving data documents; an operations manager operable to manage execution of transactions involving data documents based on one or more operations defined for the applications during its developments (Fig. 7 and p. 4 [0050] to p. 5 [0062]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Tilden et al into the teaching of Lau to have a rule manager operable to manager rules that specify logic for the handling of notifications associated with XML based action documents received at the application, the notifications requesting actions involving data documents; an operations manager operable to manage execution of transactions involving data documents based on one or more operations defined for the applications during its developments because one would want to utilize the rule set to allow customization of the behavior of the associated component of the software system.

As per claim 2, Lau discloses

Wherein the data documents may be related to another data document using an XML

based tag specified during definition of the data documents (col. 21 lines 10-15).

As per claim 3, Lau does not explicitly disclose wherein at least one data document is

remote from the application...determine the address for the data document substantially on the

fly during operation of the application.   However, Tilden discloses wherein at least one data

document is remote from the application...determine the address for the data document

substantially on the fly during operation of the application (p. 2 [0031] to p. 3 [0040]. Therefore,

it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of

Tilden et al into the teaching of Lau to have wherein at least one data document is remote from

the application...determine the address for the data document substantially on the fly during

operation of the application because one would want to facilitate the communication between

various types of data documents.

As per claim 4, Lau discloses

Wherein the action documents are defined to expose application program interface (APIs)

used to notify data documents (col. 5 lines 45 to col. 6 line 5).

As per claim 5, Tilden et al discloses

Each rule comprises a condition and one or more action statements, the application

operable to receive a notification, apply each associated rule to the notification, execute the

action statements if the condition is satisfied and return a error if the condition is not satisfied (p.

5 [0064] – [0074]).

As per claim 6, Tilden et al discloses

An action statements causing another rule to be invoked (p. 6 [0098]).

As per claim 7, Lau discloses

Wherein each operation is packaged in an XML-based request (col. 4 lines 34-44).

As per claim 8, Lau discloses

Wherein the request comprises at least one parent data document and one or more child

data documents (Fig. 2 and col. 5 lines 8-14).

As per claim 9, Tilden et al and Lau do not explicitly disclose the parent data document

comprises a purchase order and the child data documents comprises line items of the purchase

order. Official Notice is taken that a purchase order and lines items of a purchase order were well

known in the art to incorporate the teaching of the well known knowledge to have the data

documents to be a purchase order and line items of the purchase order because one would want

to implement various types of documents to meet the needs of different types of systems.

As per claim 10, Lau discloses

Wherein an operation is selected from the group consisting of creating a document,

retrieving a document, modifying a document, and deleting a document (col. 5 lines 21-22, lines

40-45, col. 6 lines 15-21).

As per claim 11, Lau discloses

Wherein one or more of the operations are made available through the framework during

definition of associated data documents to provide a rich XML interface to interfacing with these

data documents (col. 4 lines 33-50, col. 5 line 45 to col. 6 line 46).

As per claim 12, Lau discloses

Wherein the framework provides access to software development capabilities for

programming for particular needs if the operations provided through the framework are

insufficient to meet these needs (col. 2 lines 40-42, Fig. 1, col. 5 line 26 to col. 6 line 34).

As per claim 13, Lau does not explicitly disclose a service manager that managers

transfer of XML based information between the application and one or more other distributed

applications.

However, Tilden et al discloses a service manager that managers transfer of XML based

information between the application and one or more other distributed applications (Fig. 6, p. 4

[0046].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide

an efficient method for the communication between various applications.

As per claim 14, Tilden et al discloses

Wherein the services manager helps provide a peer-to-peer architecture allowing the

application to transparently access services and data associated with other distributed

applications (Fig. 6, p. 4 [0046]).

Claims 15-25, 26-27 are rejected for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-11,

13-14.s

Claim 28 is rejected for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

As per claim 29, Tilden et al discloses provides communication between the applications

in XML over HTTP format (Fig. 1 and p 2. [0027]).

Claims 30-43 are rejected for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-14.

Claims 44-54, 55-56 are rejected for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-11,

13-14.

Claim 57 is rejected for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Conclusion

3.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Wei Y Zhen whose telephone number is (703) 305-0437. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on (703) 305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wei Zhen
3/2/2004